

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-41 and 47-68 remain in this application. Claims 42-46 are cancelled. No Claims are added.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

RESPONSE TO ARGUEMENT

The rejection for the combination of the disclosure of Nakashima '251 in view of Nichani '166 is respectfully traversed on the basis that the "first signal" and the "second signal" as claimed. The claimed invention recited the first signal that is generated by an **"image-transmitting means"**, and the second signal is generated by **"electromagnetic induction means"**. With respect to Nichani '166, which disclosed a first digital image "is captured from first channel light reflected off the first external surface of the semi-opaque enclosure". The first digital image may be a **"reflected-light image"** formed with front lighting impinging on a front side of the rigid

semi-opaque enclosure. The second digital image is captured from second channel light navigating the object inside the enclosure and emanating from the first external surface of the enclosure. The second digital image may be a **“transmitted-light image”** formed with back lighting, which is directed onto a back side of the semi-opaque enclosure and thus forms a silhouette image of the object inside the enclosure.

The combination of the disclosure of Nakashima '251 in view of Nichani '166 did not disclose that the “electromagnetic induction means for generating and transmitting a second image signal” as in Claim 1. The combination of the disclosure disclosed the first signal may be a “reflected-light image”, and is “captured from first channel light”, ...(column 5, line 67-column 6, line 2). Nevertheless, the first signal of the claimed invention is generated by the “image-transmitting means” which is different from the “reflected light”. Similarly, the second signal may be a “transmitted-light image) which is different from the “second image signal” which is generated by “electromagnetic induction means”. Because of the first signal and the second signal are not “reflected-light image” or “transmitted-light image”. Thus, the combination of the disclosure of Nakashima '251 in view of Nichani '166 cannot reject the present invention. Thus, the Examiner's rejection can be traversed.

In addition, the rejection of the combination of the disclosure of the Wu '504 in view of Mager et al '093 is respectfully traversed on the that the combination of the disclosure did not disclose that the “an image processing sub-circuit,...,wherein said image processing

sub-circuit can control to switch all sub-circuits of said motionless-image processing system, and said image processing sub-circuit can perform image processing function to 'generating an image showing signal according to said first image signal and said second image signal'" as in Claim 11. With respect to Wu '504, which disclose the "image scanning system that captures image data together with the spatial information simultaneously" and thereupon a one-to-one mapping of the image data.... But, the first image signal which is caught by the transduction of optical radiation of an image sensing sub-circuit, and the second image signal is generated by "an electromagnetic induction sub-circuit" as in Claim 11. The combination of the disclosure of Wu '506 in view of Mager et al '093 did not disclose another image signal, and thus, in the disclosure of the combination of Wu '506 in view of Mager et al '093 did not disclose that "perform image processing function to generate an image showing signal according to said first image signal and said second image signal". Thus, the combination of the disclosure of Wu '506 in view of Mager et al '093 cannot reject the present invention.

Conclusion

In the light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims 1-42 and 47-68 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed that art cited but relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of these claims as currently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

This Amendment was prepared by Applicant and is being submitted without substantive change by the undersigned Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *14 Dec. 2004*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586